

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 13-18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27 and 30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 13, 18, 20-21, 25 and 30 are amended and claims 7-12, 19, 24, 28-29, 31-35 and 37 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments are merely for clarity of previously claimed subject matter. Entry is thus proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments obviate the grounds for objection. For example, independent claim 1 is amended such that the input screen and the information input window are clearly differentiated. In independent claim 13, the prescribed identifier code indicates the second application program, and is not to be converted in combination with the other user entered data. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12, 18-21, 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,272,545 to Flanagan et al. (hereafter Flanagan) in view of U.S. Patent 5,999,937 to Ellard and newly-cited U.S. Patent 5,392,447 to Schlack et al. (hereafter Schlack). The Office Action also rejects claims 13-17, 25, 27-35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Flanagan in view of U.S.

Reply to Office Action dated October 8, 2008

Patent 5,392,390 to Crozier and Ellard. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites composing data in a first application program of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA, the data being of a first format, wherein composing the data includes entering data in an input screen of the PDA associated with the first application program, and selecting a conversion of the entered data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program, wherein the selecting the conversion is performed by selecting one of menus that are displayed on the input screen. Independent claim 1 also recites that in response to selecting the menu, providing an information input window in the input screen, for a user to enter data for the second application program, the information input window being displayed on the input screen together with the composed data, and the user entering data into the information input window. Still further, independent claim 1 also recites converting the entered data to the second format of the plurality of application programs using a conversion program provided in the PDA, and storing the converted data in a database associated with the second application program, the database provided in the PDA, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively operated in the PDA, and wherein the first application program, the conversion program and the second application program are initiated and executed on the PDA, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any other of the plurality of application programs.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action (on page 6) states that neither Flanagan nor Ellard

Reply to Office Action dated October 8, 2008

teach that the different application programs have specific input screens for inputting user data. The Office Action then relies on Schlack's FIGs. 6-17 as teaching a user interface window for entering data for a plurality of different application program on a PDA. For example, Schlack discloses, in col. 8, lines 54-63, that in addition to the owner information, various function blocks are displayed on the touch panel display 14 and that the function blocks include main functions such as Information, Schedule and Memo (such as... the Schedule function block). Accordingly, Schlack teaches that the main functions are selected by an operator clicking a corresponding function of a card form. Schlack only displays one function on an input screen. In other words, Schlack does not solve problems of re-entering written data after executing another application as described in paragraphs [8]-[10] of the present specification. Therefore, Schlack exists from the one application to select another application for entering data. However, this differs from FIG. 5 of the present specification in which an application for entering data is displayed together with one application.

The applied references do not teach or suggest selecting a conversion of the entered data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program, wherein the selecting the conversion is performed by selecting one of menus that are displayed on the input screen in combination with in response to selecting the menu, providing an information input window in the input screen, for a user to enter data for the second application program, the information input window being displayed on the input screen together with the composed data, and the user entering data into the information input window.

For at least these reasons, Flanagan, Ellard and Schlack do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. The other applied reference does not teach or suggest the

Reply to Office Action dated October 8, 2008

missing features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 13 recites manually entering data including a prescribed identifier code in a first one of a plurality of application programs in the PDA, the prescribed identifier code to indicate a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the entered data is to be stored, and detecting whether or not the prescribed identifier code is present. Independent claim 13 also recites selecting the second application program among the plurality of application programs based on the prescribed identifier code using a table that matches prescribed identifier codes to corresponding application programs, and converting a format of the entered data from a first format to a second format using a conversion program provided in the PDA, the second format corresponding to a format required by the second application program. Still further, independent claim 13 recites storing the converted data in a database associated with the second application program, the database provided in the PDA, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively initiated and executed in the PDA, wherein the conversion program is capable of performing the detecting, the selecting, the converting and the storing.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 13. More specifically, Ellard (and Flanagan) does not teach or suggest that the conversion program is capable of performing the detecting, the selecting, the converting and the storing. That is, Ellard's data exchanger does not include these capabilities. Further, Crozier relates to programs that share data across disparate computer applications and platforms, such as handheld computers and desktop computers. The data may be first translated to a common format based on the user-specified mapping of data fields via the HHCOMM 113 and the DTCOMM 117.

Reply to Office Action dated October 8, 2008

See Crozier's ABSTRACT and FIGs. 1-2. In addition, Crozier discloses that associated fields of the handheld computer and the desktop computer are matched by a user clicking each field one by one. See Crozier's col. 9, line 61-col. 10, line 9, and FIG. 5.

For at least these reasons, Flanagan, Ellard and Crozier do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 13. The other applied reference does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 13. Independent claim 13 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 18 recites entering data by a user in a first one of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA, each of the plurality of application programs having mutually different data formats, wherein the first application program is a document editing program, and selecting a second application program in which to store the entered data. Independent claim 18 also recites converting the entered data by the user in the document editing program to a second format used by the second application program using a conversion program provided in the PDA, the second application program comprising one of a contact manager, an appointment scheduler, a telephone number organizer or a task list. Still further, independent claim 18 recites storing the converted data in the second application program, wherein the first application program, the conversion program and the second application program are initiated and executed on the PDA, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any other one of the plurality of application programs. Independent claim 18 also recites that converting the entered data comprises: providing an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second application program, the information input window being displayed on an

Reply to Office Action dated October 8, 2008

input screen together with the data composed in the first application program, and assigning data entered through the information input window to corresponding data fields of the second application program.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 18, which may include features from previous dependent claim 19. More specifically, Flanagan, Ellard and Schlack do not teach or suggest that converting the entered data comprises: providing an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second application program, the information input window being displayed on an input screen together with the data composed in the first application program, and assigning data entered through the information input window to corresponding data fields of the second application program. Additionally, Flanagan, Ellard and Schlack do not teach or suggest entering data in a first one of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA in combination with converting the entered data in the document editing program to a second format used by the second application program using a conversion program provided in the PDA.

For at least these reasons, Flanagan, Ellard and Schlack do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 18. The other applied reference does not teach or suggest the missing feature. Thus, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 25 recites an input/output interface of the PDA, configured to receive commands from a user and to display information, the input/output interface to enter data associated with a first application program based on inputs of a user, the entered data including an identification marker to identify a second application program. Independent claim 25 also

Reply to Office Action dated October 8, 2008

recites a central processing unit (CPU) of the PDA, and a memory of the PDA, configured to accommodate a plurality of databases associated with a plurality of application programs, the plurality of databases provided in the PDA. Independent claim 25 also recites that a first application program stored on the PDA is configured to receive and store data in a first database using a first data format, a second application program stored on the PDA is configured to receive and store data in a second database using a second data format, the second data format selected based on the identification marker that identifies the second application program. Still further, independent claim 25 also recites that the conversion program performs manual conversion of data by generating an information input window within the first application program for inputting data in prescribed fields of the second application program.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 25, which may include features from previous dependent claim 29. More specifically, Flanagan, Ellard and Schlack do not teach or suggest that the conversion program performs manual conversion of data by generating an information input window within the first application program for inputting data in prescribed fields of the second application program. Crozier does not teach or suggest missing features. Thus, independent claim 25 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 25 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

Reply to Office Action dated October 8, 2008

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 13-18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27 and 30 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: December 24, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\Fk4\Documents\2031\2031-005\178368.doc